G.R.S. IX—5]

Previous references.

G.7. 62-22 sl 172
" " ols 3-10

1922.

(G7)

File No. 4-22

Serial Nos. 101-103

Later references.

Reserve
2.11.23

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

P226-E

Serial Nos. 3

Part B for May 1923

SUBJECT

Memorial of Mr. S. Krishna Murthy Rao, late asst. in the Comptr's Office for grant of an Enhanced Pension

101) Fe 5-1923 d 30/5/1923
to the Comptr Mea—
Directs that the compassionate allowance granted, be allowed to him from the date the Subsistance allowance ceased.

BSR
30/5/23

3589-/28

G. R. S. III-2.

General and Revenue Secretariat.

GJ File No. 4 of 1928

Serial No.

From Mr. T. Krishnamurthi Rao,
Retd. Accountant of the Comptroller's Office
memorial dated 14th March 1923
praying for the grant of full
pension than he was entitled to
on the date of his superannuation &c.

GJ 62-20-S1(1+2)
do (3-10).

The previous papers are put up.
On a consideration of the facts
contained in his memorial, a compara-
tionate pension of Rs 13-3-0 was sanc-
tioned vide Rules (pages 5-8)
Subd for orders of collection 62-20(3-10)

L & V.

dated 24.3.23) 26/3

The representations of the
petitioner have been fully considered before
and there are no new facts or
points now brought
forward calling for reconsideration
of the Case. If approved, petitioner
will be informed accordingly

26/3/23

(H Srey)
Joint Secretary

mnk
29.3.23

5000-27.
2.4.23.

Secy. An Endt may issue to the Petnr.
Such orders passed cannot be reconsidered

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

Draft mnk 4/4

3.4.23

ordered
mnk
3/4/23

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

File No. 3818-89 of 19

Serial No.

Draft putup

24/4

Issue

8/4/23

Endorsement No H 4702 d 10.4.23 granted to mr S Krishnamurthi Doddamavalli Bazaar stating that Govt see no reason to reconsider the orders already passed.

101

From Mr S Krishnamurthi

Memorial d 15-4-23

A copy of the same petition memorial was received some time back and an endorsement granted to the party stating that Govt see no reason to reconsider the orders already passed

Sd/- 19.4.23

Sd/- 17/4 Le Fanu

19/4/23

Dewan

DEWAN'S OFFICE.
Rcvd. on APR 23 1923
Reg. No. 6237

23.4.23

Put the Chance the file of the H Sy regg bills since all Urdu is put till after 19. If not till he sees the Memorial the orders are altered

Issues as per Secretariat

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

A This is not clear. 'A' is not traceable in the file nor any order issued from Rev Secrt Mdu 26-4-23

Serial No.

I think the intention of the G.O. of 10.12.21 was to give him the Compassionate allowance from the date the Subsistence all.ce ceased. The expression which was used in the order was "from date of his removal from Service". In the circs of the case the date on which his Subsistence all.ce was withdrawn s/d have been considered as the date of termination of his Services. On ahead of this I find from enquiry of the Comptr's office that he was given the Compassionate all.ce from 5.10.20 the date on which the ~~order~~ order directing the dispensing with his Services was passed. It is fair to give him the Compassionate all.ce from date of withdrawal of the Subsistence all.ce and this Consideration may be shown to him. It is not to give him the ~~Compassionate~~ Subsistence all.ce i.e. Rs25 which is higher than the Compassionate all.ce i.e. Rs 13-3-0 for the period for which the former was deliberately withdrawn in view of his having

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

G. R. S. III-2

General and Revenue Secretariat.

G D File No. 4 of 1927

Serial No.

DEWAN'S OFFICE
Recd. on APR 27 1928
Reg. No. 63/16

of by having been convicted by the Magistrate who first tried him.

Dewan

26/4/28

Copies of Orders may be issued accordingly

Issue orders to Complt and inform Petr. accdly

9.5.28

Draft G.O. & an endorsement is submitted for approval.

28/5/28

101 To Comptroller, D No 5423 of 30.5.23.

Directs that the Compassionate allowance of Rs 13/3/0 sanctioned to S. Krishnamurthi Rao may be allowed to him from the date the Subsistence allowance ceased instead of from the date of the order directing the dispensing with his services.

B

NOTE—Contn. sheet.

102 Copy to do. Petnr. No K 5424 of 30.5.23

Recd by Regd post. 16.3.23

Forwarded with compliments

Recd 17.3.23

7598-471.

17.3.23

To

RAJAMANTRAPRAVINA

P. Raghavendra Rao, Esquire, B.A., B.L.,

First Member of Council,

B A N G A L O R E.

Your Excellency,

I, the undersigned S. Krishnamurthi Rao, late 1st grade Accountant, Comptroller's Office and attached to Krishnaraja Sagar Works, respectfully beg leave to submit as follows:-

I most respectfully beg permission to invite Your Excellency's kind reference to my humble memorial submitted to the Devan Saheb on 9-7-21 and to the other records quoted in the body of this memorial. Not having been favoured with any consideration of my case, I approach Your Excellency with this humble memorial. The facts of my case have already been stated at some length but I may reiterate the main features in a brief way.

2. I was an accountant as stated above and was unanimously elected as Honorary Secretary of the Co-Operative Society at Krishnarajasagar Works. Certain charges were brought against me as Secretary, in Mysore Sub Divisional Magistrate's Court which were considered to be true by the Magistrate but were found to be untrue and unfounded by the District and Sessions Judge of Mysore who set aside the conviction and sentence wrongly passed by the Sub Divisional Magistrate and acquitted me honorably.

3. The Comptroller having misconstrued

misinterpreted a portion of the Sessions Judge's judgment and relying upon the illegal and untenable finding of the lower court not supported by, but contrary to, the evidence on record, and taking the judgment of the Sessions Judge in the light of one of partial conviction though it was one of honourable acquittal, recommended my removal from service. A more unjust treatment could scarcely be conceived. I do not wish to enlarge on the iniquity of the treatment as I am more concerned with the result.

4. At that time that is just before July 1920, certain defalcations of Government money in the P.W.,& the Electrical Departments having come to light and the reputation of the Accounts Department in that connection, as it seemed to be, having been at a discount in the opinion of the Government and the public, they wanted to belie that opinion by punishing some one, at least, by proxy whom they could find at random. Fortunately for them, they found me handy though my case had nothing to do with the situation they had created and was quite unconnected with the department and though the charge brought against me was one for doing the right thing in a wrong way. They therefore thought it fit to make a scape-goat of me and the Financial Secretary falling in with their views of the Comptroller supported the latter's recommendation without the slightest thought of what injustice he was doing to an innocent man and without any regard to the pronouncement of a Judicial Tribunal whose judgment is thoroughly convincing to any unbiased mind and exhaustive unlike the flimsy nature of that of the Lower Court. From the judgment of the Sessions Judge it can be seen

clearly seen that there was not even a prima facie case against me to frame a charge. In proof of this I beg to give the following extract from his learned judgment. (1) "The evidence shows clearly that the clerk was in charge of the Stores where goods were kept and that the appellant (this humble memorialist) was exercising acts of supervision over the goods of the Society." (2) "From the rules of the Society and from the evidence on record it is difficult to find that the appellant was entrusted with property in question or dominion over it. Indeed the Magistrate has not recorded any such finding on the point. The Public Prosecutor has failed to convince me that the evidence on the record establishes any trust in respect of the property.. (3) "There is no evidence that the appellant dishonestly used any property entrusted to him. There is no any such finding by the Magistrate. (4) "There is no finding as to when and how the accused criminally misappropriated the sale proceeds.

5. The position taken by the Comptroller in dealing with my case on the misinterpretation referred to above (compare the last 2 paras of the Sessions Judge's Judgment in the light of his findings in paras 5, 6, and 7 thereof with para 2 of Comptroller's letter No. 360 K. dated 23/2 th August 1920 to the Financial Secretary where the laboured distortion or misinterpretation would be manifest) was perfectly untenable as can be seen from the fact that when I presented him with an application on 6-4-21 enclosing a copy of the Sessions Judge's endorsement referred to in para 3 of my memorial to the Dewan Saheb, he was pleased to say that he was convinced of the fact that I

been honourably acquitted by the judge but that he recommended my removal from service on his own view of the case. I met him with the argument (1) that he had not held any departmental enquiry and investigated the case making me a party and taking my explanation, (2) that I had not served him direct to enable him to form an opinion of my work and conduct, (3) that the various officers under whom I had served had recorded very favourable opinions of the same and that (4) his sitting in judgment over and setting aside the pronouncement of a District and Sessions Judge as his recommendation to Government would show, would be derogatory to the position of a judicial tribunal. He at once changed his position for the third time and told me that as the Head of the Department he was perfectly justified in dealing with his subordinates as he liked and refused ever to receive my application. I leave it to your Excellency to see whether this was a biased attitude or not.

6. I then submitted my petition to the Financial Secretary for my reinstatement in the service on a reconsideration of the orders already passed in the light of the Sessions Judge's endorsement since received. He did not deem it fit to take my representation to his heart in consideration but allowed it to remain unanswered till he was roused to do so by my memorial to the Dewan Saheb submitted in July 21. He then asked me to submit to him the original endorsement of the Sessions Judge and on perusing it flew into a rage, condemned it as unauthorised and illegal and said that he would not attach any value to it but consider it as a dead letter and not be influenced by

it in passing orders on my memorial. It however went to the Comptroller for his opinion and the acting Comptroller had the goodness to submit his opinion to Government after three months' deliberation in September 1921. The Dewan Saheb, I am inclined to believe, had then to pass such an order as would be in conformity with the inclinations of the Financial Secretary and the Comptroller with a view, probably, to protect the Official prestige without any regard to the injustice that would be perpetrated in the case of a poor and honest official who had faithfully served the Government for a long time. In reply to that petition I was informed by the Financial Secretary in his No. F.L. 3118 dated 10-12-21 that a compassionate allowance of Rs 13-3-0 had been sanctioned for me. Why I could not be reinstated in service, why the pension to which I was entitled to could not be sanctioned and how Rs 13-3-0 was arrived at, I was not given to understand. These are facts, in their opinion, that I am not entitled to know. Even the beinest criminal before being punished will be informed of the charges brought against him but that has been denied to me.

7. It was not an appeal for charity that I submitted and if the truth were told, I might not unnaturally have made such an appeal as I am in dire poverty. I have given the best of myself to Mysore, I have given the best and the greater part of my life to it. Mine is not a case of deprivation of luxuries but of necessities. I have not hitherto urged that plea. I have accepted my poverty and struggles and have asked solely for justice. My expectations of life are very short and it is a small sum to pay for an honest conscience which would be repaid in full measure.

6. I was an official drawing Rs 100/- per mensem for a number of years and had put in an active service of over 19 years when the case commenced. It dragged on for over three years and nine months and Government Orders on my application for reinstatement were passed in October 1920. From 1st December 1916, the date on which the case commenced, I was given a subsistence allowance of Rs 25 per mensem and it was stopped during the pendancy of the case from May 19 all on a sudden. My application for arrears of pay from the date of suspension in December 1916 to the date of Government order dispensing with my services in October 20 met with a refusal. I applied for payment of, at least, the subsistence allowance from the date of its abrupt stoppage to the date of Government order and I was told that I was not entitled to it. I asked to be given only the benefits of the provisions contained in the Mysore Service Regulations and the Comptroller's orders in the matter have been altogether at variance as can be seen from the following facts. When I applied for continuing the subsistence allowance which had been abruptly stopped I was told in Comptroller's No. 182 A. dated 9/10-[illegible]-19 that the allowance could not be given except as provided for in article 123 of the Mysore Service Regulations. I submitted that the article cited did not apply to my request inasmuch as I did not ask for any pay or the final adjustment of the allowances contemplated in that article but for the continuance of the allowance already sanctioned under Article 112 (b) of the Mysore Service Regulations and which had been stopped without any reason. I was told that no allowance would be given till my case was finally disposed of. This

order was said to be in accordance with art. 123 of the M. S. R. -Vide Comptroller's No. 406 R. dated 16-9-19. After the case was finally decided I applied for the settlement of the allowances as contemplated in art. 123 and the reply was that I was not entitled to the benefits of art. 123 as I had not been re-instated as required by Art. 122- Vide Comptroller's No. 606 R. dated 23-10-20. How conflicting those orders are can very well be seen. I was asking for the continuance of the payment, till the case was closed, of the allowance once sanctioned and was told that it could not be granted as if fresh sanction was asked for. Arts. 122 and 123 do not lay down any restriction for the continuance of the allowance nor do they contemplate the stoppage of the same during the middle of the suspension period. Reinstatement is not a condition precedant for the same, the allowance having been already sanctioned. It is not found either in the articles referred to above or any where else in the M. S. R., that reinstatement is necessary for continuing the payment of the subsistence allowance or for the adjustment of the allowances after the termination of the case for the disbursement of the full amount of salary under art. 123 as I have been completely acquitted of blame.

9. For the settlement of my claims on the adjustment of the allowances that art. 122(b) does not apply can be seen from the fact that my suspension was not a penalty for any misconduct in my official capacity. But on account of my arrest on a false criminal charge, (Vide art. 121) maliciously brought against me by evil minded persons as the result would show. From the above it will

be seen that I have been inflicted with four different punishments without finding or assigning any cause for the same. They are, first I was deprived of the appointment, second, the grant of arrears of pay was refused, though I am fully entitled to it in accordance with Art. 123 of the M. S. R., third, the payment of the subsistence allowances sanctioned under Art. 120 was abruptly stopped, it was refused to be continued or to be paid up to the time my services were dispensed with and fourth, the grant of pension that I was properly entitled to was not sanctioned.

10. I therefore most respectfully beg to request that Your Excellency will be graciously pleased to take my pitiable case into your generous consideration and pass orders for the grant of any one or more of the following prayers:-

(a) Grant of my arrears of salary from the date of suspension (1-12-16) up to the date of Government Order dispensing with my services (5-10-20) in accordance with the provision contained in Art. 123 of the M. S. R., and the grant of pension that I will be entitled to on that date; or at least either of these.

23x100
------ = 38 1/3
60

= R. 38.

or (b) the grant of subsistence allowance from May 1919, the date from which it was abruptly stopped to the date of Government order (5-10-20) and the pension that I will be entitled to on that date.

23 x 185 851
-------- = ---
60 x 2 24

= R. 35.

or (c) the grant of pension that I will be entitled to on the date of my suspension (1-12-16).

19 x 185 703
-------- = ----
60 x 2 24

= R. 30.

11. Against R. 38 as per Sub para (a) above or R. 35/- as per Sub para (b) or R. 30/- as per Sub para (c), I have been given an allowance of R. 13-3-0 only. It is this piece of injustice that I am submitting to Your Excellency to reconsider and pass more humane orders.

12. With this humble prayer I beg leave to subscribed as

Your Excellency's most obedient and,
Humble Servant,

Bangalore City.
14th March 1923.

A. Krishnamurthy Rao

No. 1 Kempanna's Lane, Doddamavalli.

G. R. S. VI—G/32]

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to——————

General and Revenue Secretariat

( )

, *the* *191* .

Date of issue 10 April/23

Signed by [illegible]

Section

File No.

Serial No

No. H 4762

Endorsement granted

To S. Krishnamurti Rao
No. 1. Kempanna's lane,
Dodda marakki
Bangalore city

With reference to his memorial dated 14th March 1923 requesting ~~that~~ this ~~to~~ grant of arrears of Salary and enhanced pension etc,

The petitioner is informed that Govt see no reason to reconsider the orders already passed.

over.

By order

8/4/23

[illegible]

To

A. R. Banerji, Esquire, M.A., C.S.I., C.I.E.,
Dewan of Mysore,
B A N G A L O R E.

Your Excellency,

I, the undersigned S. Krishnamurthi Rao, late 1st grade Acccuntant, Comptroller's Office and attached to Krishnaraja Sagar Works, respectfully beg leave to submit as follows:-

I most respectfully beg permission to invite Your Excellency's kind reference to my humble memorial submitted to the Dewan Saheb on 9-7-21 and to the other records quoted in the body of this memorial. Not having been favoured with any consideration of my case, I approach Your Excellency with this humble memorial. The facts of my case have already been stated at some length but I may reiterate the main features in a brief way.

2. I was an accountant as stated above and was unanimously elected as Honorary Secretary of the Co-Operative Society at Krishnarajasagara Works. Certain charges were brought against me, as Secretary, in Mysore Sub Division Magistrate's Court which were considered to be true by the Magistrate but were found to be untrue and unfounded by the District and Sessions Judge of Mysore who set aside the conviction and sentence wrongly passed by the Sub Divisional Magistrate and acquitted me honorably.

3. The Comptroller having misconstrued and misinterpreted a portion of the Sessions Judge's

judgment and relying upon the illegal and untenable finding of the lower court not supported by, but contrary to, the evidence on record, and taking the judgment of the Sessions Judge in the light of one of partial conviction though it was one of honourable acquittal, recommended my removal from service. A more unjust treatment could scarcely be conceived. I do not wish to enlarge on the iniquity of the treatment as I am more concerned with the result.

4. At that time that is just before July 1920, certain defalcations of Government money in the P. W.,& the Electrical Departments having come to light and the reputation of the Accounts Department in that connection, as it seemed to be, having been at a discount in the opinion of the Government and the public, they wanted to belie that opinion by punishing some one, at least, by proxy whom they could find at random. Fortunately for them, they found me handy though my case had nothing to do with the situation they had created and was quite unconnected with the department and though the charge brought against me was one for doing the right thing in a wrong way. They then thought it fit to make a scape-goat of me and the Financial Secretary falling in with the views of the Comptroller supported the latter's recommendation without the slightest thought of what injustice he was doing to an innocent man and without any regard to the pronouncement of a Judicial Tribunal whose judgment is thoroughly convincing to any unbiased mind and exhaustive unlike the flimsy nature of that of the Lower Court. From the judgment of the Sessions Judge it can be very clearly seen that there was not even a prima-facie

case against me to frame a charge. In proof of this I beg to give the following extract from his learned judgment. (1) "The evidence shows clearly that the clerk was in charge of the Stores where goods were kept and that the appallant (this humble memorialist) was exercising acts of supervision over the goods of the Society." (2) "From the rules of the Society and from the evidence on record it is difficult to find that the appallant was entrusted with property in question or dominion over it. Indeed the Magistrate has not recorded any such finding on the point. The Public Prosecutor has failed to convince me that the evidence on the record establishes any trust in respect of the property. (3) "There is no evidence that the appallant dishonestly used any property entrusted to him. (4) "There is no finding as to when and how the accused criminally misappropriated the sale proceeds.

5. The position taken by the Comptroller in dealing with my case on the misinterpretation referred to above (compare the last 2 paras of the Sessions Judge's Judgment in the light of his findings in paras 5, 6 and 7 thereof with para 2 of Comptroller's letter No. 360 R. dated 23/28th August 1920 to the Financial Secretary when the laboured distortion or misinterpretation would be manifest) was perfectly untenable as can be seen from the fact that when I presented him with an application on 6-4-21 enclosing a copy of the Sessions Judge's endorsement referred to in para 3 of my memorial to the Dewan Saheb, he was pleased to say that he was convinced of the fact that I had been honourably acquitted by the Judge but that he recommended my removal from service on his own

view of the case. I met him with the argument (1) that he had not held any departmental enquiry and investigated the case making me a party and taking my explanation , (2) that I had not served him direct to enable him to form an opinion of my work and conduct , (3) that the various officers under whom I had served had recorded very favourable opinions of the same and that , (4) his sitting in judgment over and setting aside the pronouncement of a District and Sessions Judge as his recommendation to Government would show, would be derogatory to the position of a judicial tribunal. He at once changed his position for the third time and told me that as the Head of the Department; he was perfectly justified in dealing with his subordinates as he liked and refused even to receive my application. I leave it to Your Excellency to see whether this was a biased attitude or not.

6. I then submitted my petition to the Financial Secretary for my reinstatement in the service on a reconsideration of the orders already passed in the light of the Sessions Judge's endorsment since received. He did not deem it fit to take my representation to his benign consideration but allowed it to remain unanswered till he was roused to do so by my memorial to the Dewan Saheb submitted in July 21. He then asked me to submit to him the original endorsement of the Sessions Judge and on perusing it flew into a rage, condemed it as unauthorised and illegal and said that he would not attach any value to it but consider it as a dead letter and not be influenced by it in passing orders on my memorial. It however went to the Comptroller for his opinion and the acting Comptroller had the goodness to submit his

opinion to Government after three months' deliberation in September 1921. The Dewan Saheb, I am inclined to believe, had then to pass such an order as would be in conformity with the inclinations of the Financial Secretary and the Comptroller with a view, probably, to protect the Official prestige without any regard to the injustice that would be perpetrated in the case of a poor and honest official who had faithfully served the Government for a long time. In reply to that petition I was informed by the Financial Secretary in His No. F.L. 3118 dated 10-12-21 that a compassionate allowance of Rs 13-3-0 had been sanctioned for me. Why I could not be reinstated in service, why the pension to which I was entitled to could not be sanctioned and how Rs 13-3-0 was arrived at, I was not given to understand. These are facts, in their opinion, that I am not entitled to know. Even the beinest criminal before being punished will be informed of the charges brought against him but that has been denied to me.

7. It was not an appeal for charity that I submitted and if the truth were told, I might not unnaturally have made such an appeal as I am in dire poverty. I have given the best of myself to Mysore, I have given the best and the greater part of my life to it. Mine is not a case of deprivation of luxuries but of necessities. I have not hitherto urged that plea. I have accepted my poverty and struggles and have asked solely for justice. My expectations of life are very short and it is a small sum to pay for an honest conscience which would be repaid in full measure.

8 I was an official drawing Rs 100/- per

Art. 123 of the M. S. R., -Vide Comptroller's No. 406 R. dated 16-9-19. After the case was finally decided I applied for the settlement of the allowances as contemplated in Art. 123 and the reply was that I was not entitled to the benefits of Art. 123 as I had not been re-instated as required by Art. 122 -Vide Comptroller's No. 606 R. dated 23-10-20. How conflicting these orders are can very well be seen. I was asking for the continuance of the payment, till the case was closed, of the allowance once sanctioned and was told that it could not be granted as if fresh sanction was asked for. Arts. 122 and 123 do not lay down any restriction for the continuance of the allowance nor do they contemplate the stoppage of the same during the middle of the suspension period. Reinstatement is not a condition precedant for the same, the allowance having been already sanctioned. It is not found either in the articles referred to above or any where else in the M. S. R., that reinstatement is necessary for continuing the payment of the subsistence allowance or for the adjustment of the allowances after the termination of the case for the disbursement of the full amount of salary under Art. 123 as I have been completely acquitted of blame.

9. For the settlement of my claims and the adjustment of the allowances that Art. 122 (b) does not apply can be seen from the fact that my suspension was not a penalty for any misconduct in my official capacity. But on account of my arrest on a false criminal charge, (Vide Art. 123) maliciously brought against me by evil minded persons as the result would show. From the above it will be seen that I have been inflicted with four

different punishments without finding or assigning any cause for the same. They are, first, I was deprived of the appointment, second, the grant of arrears of pay was refused, though I am fully entitled to it in accordance with Art. 123 of the M. S. R., third, the payment of the subsistence allowances sanctioned under Art. 122 was abruptly stopped, it was refused to be continued or to be paid up to the time my services were dispensed with and fourth, the grant of pension that I was properly entitled to was not sanctioned.

10. I therefore most respectfully beg to request that Your Excellency will be graciously pleased to take my pitiable case into your generous consideration and pass orders for the grant of any one or more of the following prayers:-

(a) Grant of my arrears of salary from the date of suspension (1-12-16) up to the date of Government Order dispensing with my services (5-10-20) in accordance with the provision contained in Art. 123 of the M.S.R., and the grant of pension that I will be entitled to on that date; or at least either of these.

$$\frac{23 \times 100}{60} = 38\ 1/3$$

= Rs. 38.

or (b) The grant of subsistence allowance from May 1919, the date from which it was abruptly stopped to the date of Government order (5-10-20) and the pension that I will be entitled to on that date.

$$\frac{23 \times 185}{60 \times 2} = \frac{651}{24}$$

= Rs. 35.

or (c) The grant of pension that I will be entitled to on the date of my suspension (1-12-16).

$$\frac{19 \times 185}{60 \times 2} = \frac{703}{24}$$

= Rs. 30.

11. Against Rs. 38 as per Sub para (a) above or Rs. 35/- as per Sub para (b) or Rs. 30/- as per.

Sub para (c), I have been given an allowance of Rs 13-3-0 only. It is this piece of injustice that I am submitting to Your Excellency to re-consider and pass more humane orders.

12. With this humble prayer I beg leave to subscribed as

Your Excellency's Most Obedient and
Humble Servant,

Bangalore City.
14th March 1923.

S Krishnamurthirao

No. 1 Kempanna's Lane, Doddamavalli.

Fair draft

PROCEEDINGS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS
THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

R e a d :-

Government Order No.Fl.3117/G.F.62-20-7 dated 10th December 1921 sanctioning a compassionate allowance of Rs.13-3-0 per mensem to S.Krishnamurthi Rao, late Accountant, Comptroller's office.

2. Memorial dated 14th March 1923 from S.Krishnamurthi Rao - requesting for reasons stated a higher pension than was allowed to him in the Government order noted above.

Order No. Fl: 5423/G.F 6-22-WR

Dated Bangalore the 30th May 1923.

Government are pleased to direct that the compassionate allowance of Rs.13-3-0 sanctioned to S.Krishnamurthi Rao may be allowed to him from the date the subsistence allowance ceased instead of from the - date of the order directing the dispensing with his services.

FAIR DRAFT.

30/5

For Financial Secretary to Govt.

To

The Comptroller,Mysore Government.

MK.

G. R. S. VI—G/3

(2 dpd)

SUBJECT.....

.....

.....

Diary No. of letter replied to 4127

General and Revenue Secretariat

(Gd)

, the 191 .

Date of issue 30. 5. '23

Signed by M. C. A. R.

Section Gd

File No. 4/22

Serial No. 102

Proceedings of Govt

Read

G.O.No. M 3117/Gd 62-20-7 dt 10.12.1921 sanctioning a Compassionate allowance of Rs 13-3-0 p.m. to S. Krishnamurthi Rao, late Asstt. Comptroller's office.

2) Memorial dt 14.3.23 from S. Krishnamurthi Rao requesting for reasons stated a higher pension than was allowed to him in the G.O. noted above:

Order.

over.

G.H 4-22-10

Order No: 71 5423 - 30.5.13

Govt. are pleased to direct that the

Contingencies allowance of Rs 13-3-0 sanctioned

~~given to~~ Mr. S. Krishnamurthi Rao may be allowed to him

~~to have effect~~ from the date the

Subsistence allowance ceased to be drawn by him from the

from May 1910 & not from the date of the orders directing the

date of his removal from service dispensing with

as stated in the G.O. referred to. his services.

28/5/13

Dr. H. Secy

Mail: HM
26/5/13

To Comptroller & Govt.

List of enclosures.

Copied by

Examined by